In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, Chandigarh

C.W.P. No. 14700 of 2006
Date of Decision: September 14, 2006

Poonam

…Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

…Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

PRESENT: Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JUDGMENT

M.M. KUMAR, J. (Oral)

The date of birth of the petitioner is 20.3.1989. On the date of appointment as Anganwari Worker on 16.5.2006, the petitioner was less than 18 years of age and could not be appointed as such. Accordingly, the order dated 4.9.2006 (P-5) has been passed on the ground that she did not fulfil the minimum age condition as per the Rules. Accordingly, her appointment has been cancelled by the impugned order dated 4.9.2006.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and granting her opportunity of hearing, we find that on facts it could not be successfully disputed that the age of the petitioner is 17 years plus

and that she is not 18 years of age fulfilling the minimum age condition. In such a situation, we are of the opinion that no show cause notice was required to be issued because the appointment was void-ab-initio. Even before us nothing could be shown that she is 18 years of age.

Dismissed.

(M.M. KUMAR)
JUDGE

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

September 14, 2006
Pkapoor